

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe

Vol. I, No. 6

Saturday, December 7, 1918

Price, 3 Cents

The Stranglers of Socialism?

THE international situation, in one phase, is a race between the coming of the peace conference and the completion of a proletarian revolution in Germany. Which comes first will determine largely the character of the peace and the course of events in Germany itself.

Just prior to the revolution, it was a race between armistice and the revolution, between Marshal Foch and Karl Liebknecht. The Revolution and Liebknecht conquered. But it was a conquest that marked simply the first stage of the Revolution; the next necessary conquest, which alone will make the Revolution a real revolution, is the conquest of Capitalism and Imperialism, the establishment of a Socialist proletarian government.

The reactionary press in this country and the reactionary press in Germany are equally against the coming of this new revolution. It is being declared by the American press and repeated in Germany by the reactionary moderates, that in the event of a Socialist proletarian government the United States and the Allies would refuse to negotiate with such a government and perhaps declare war upon it.

In other words, our reactionary press proposes that the United States and the people of the United States should become the stranglers of the Revolution in Germany, the stranglers of Socialism. This is a monstrous proposal, the consummation of which would make the United States the executioner of democracy, usurping the functions of Czarism.

It is a serious proposition. The American press is trying to distort the problem of the coming peace into a problem of action to crush the German proletarian revolution.

In its issue of November 25, the Boston *American* published a Washington dispatch, which said:

"Accepting as true the reports that the radicals under Karl Liebknecht have gained control of the government, it was pointed out today that an understanding between the new German control and the Lenin-Trotsky domination at Petrograd is almost certain. That this would mean very serious complications in the effort to arrange a permanent peace was the general opinion of officials here."

Why? Why should a Socialist proletarian government in Germany complicate the efforts to arrange a permanent peace?

Is it because this Socialist government would propose a reactionary peace, would act against permanent peace? On the contrary: it is only by means of this government, it is only by means of the annihilation of capitalist Imperialism, that permanent peace can be secured. The proletarian revolution in Germany, in accord with the proletarian revolution in Russia, adheres to the program of a real democratic peace. The Bolsheviks and the Russian people have fought and starved and died to assure this peace; and the proletarian revolution in Germany and Russia is a real guaranty of a people's peace, of the coming of permanent peace.

Would a Socialist proletarian government in Germany complicate the peace problems because the Allies could not negotiate with such a government? But why should the Allies refuse to negotiate with a Socialist proletarian government? If this government proposes democratic terms of peace, if this government seeks to make peace secure and permanent, then the proposal that the Allies should refuse to negotiate with this government means that the refusal would be based upon the fact of this government being a Socialist revolutionary government. If the German people decide in favor of a Socialist government, that

is their right; the proposal to crush Socialism, as it is being proposed, would mean that the war to make the world safe for democracy is to become a war to crush Socialism and make the world safe for Imperialism.

If the proposal to refuse negotiations with a Socialist proletarian government in Germany is because of the democratic proposals of peace that this government would make, then the American press declares in so many words that it wants a reactionary peace, and that all its declamation about a permanent peace is contemptible camouflage. Already sinister forces of reaction are proposing an imperialistic peace, are suggesting making peace in the good old way of the past, with indiscriminate annexations and indemnities—and the threat of new wars. These forces of reaction control influential newspapers and influential personages, and their campaign for a reactionary peace and larger armaments is assuming formidable proportions.

The issue, as expressed in a portion of the American press, is an issue of Socialism against Imperialism—and Socialism must conquer!

The New York *Times*, in its December 1 issue, editorially says:

"Again and again, at the meeting of the Central Soldiers' and Workmen's Council at Berlin, Hugo Haase and others warned their comrades that President Wilson 'would only conclude peace with a stable democratic government in which all classes were represented.' Richard Mueller, Chief Executive of the Council, described this assertion 'as an invention of the reactionary press.' Yet, since President Wilson meant what he said about making the world safe for democracy, Mr. Haase is absolutely right and Mr. Mueller is not only wrong, but he knows he is wrong and is whistling to keep his spirits up."

In other words, the *Times* declares that it is the purpose of the Allies not to conclude peace with a Socialist Germany, and intimates that making the world safe for democracy is synonymous with crushing Socialism.

What is the attitude of the government? And what

is the attitude of the American people? The suggestions of the *Times* and of other reactionary newspapers are sinister proposals of Imperialism, a call upon the American people to make sacrifices of blood and treasure to—assure the supremacy of Capitalism and Imperialism in Germany!

The peculiar mental jugglery—and the defense of Imperialism requires the most peculiar, insolent and shameless mental jugglery—by which the *Times* concludes that making the world safe for democracy is synonymous with crushing Socialism, is indicated in the following words:

"The Bolsheviks, whether Russian or German, do not want democracy. They want a Government in which the proletariat, one class, shall rule all other classes; and in Russia they have shown that this rule is not to be a mild one, but one of bloody tyranny. The Bolsheviks, in fact, adopt the same principles as that of the Middle Ages, in which one class ruled all other classes. The only difference is that in the Middle Ages it was the aristocratic class which ruled, and the Bolsheviks propose to substitute the rule of the working classes. The aristocratic class ruled mildly in some places, harshly in others; the proletariat begins, at least, by ruling ferociously everywhere that it gains power. Mr. Mueller is perfectly right and desirably clear on this difference between Bolshevik rule and democratic rule, which last is not the rule of any class, but the rule of the whole people: 'We don't want a democratic republic. We want a socialist, nay, a proletarian, republic.' Enough has been said. No democracy; democracy is spurned."

This is a rare specimen of logic. The Bolshevik principle of government "is the same principle as that of the Middle Ages, in which one class ruled all other classes." That is a formidable indictment; it evokes visions of a small class of aristocrats, very small in number, who toiled not, neither did they spin, thriving in wealth and luxury by exploiting the mass of the people. That was the Middle Ages—the mass of the people, the workers and producers, denied all share in the government and the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor. But the *Times* proceeds: "The only difference is that in the Middle Ages it was the aristocratic class that ruled, and the Bolsheviks propose to substitute the rule of the working classes." Well, well, well! The "only difference"? But it appears a big and fundamental difference. The aristocratic class was an idle class of robbers and murderers, a very small part of the population, performing no necessary social function; the working class is a producing class, the overwhelming majority of the people, performing the fundamental social function of production—is not a tremendous difference comprised in this? Moreover, the mass of the serfs could not become aristocrats; but the members of the very small class of nobles and non-producing bourgeois in Russia, and we hope soon in Germany, can become members of the working class and participate in the Government by becoming useful producers, workers performing socially necessary functions. The Bolshevik ideal is not "government by one class"—that is Capitalism; but the abolition of all classes, a society in which all persons are comprised in the communistically organized producers.

The development of a Socialist proletarian government in Germany will not complicate peace—unless the purpose of the coming peace is to assure the supremacy of Capitalism and Imperialism.

Self-determination of peoples, in word and in deed! Self-determination for Socialist Russia and for the coming Socialist Germany!

MASS MEETING

German and Russian Revolution

Sunday, December 8, 1918
at 2.30 o'clock

Grand Opera House

Cor. Washington and Dover Sts.
BOSTON, MASS.

SPEAKERS:

JOHN REED

Recently Returned from Russia

LUDWIG LORE

Editor of the "Volkszeitung" German Socialist Daily

LOUIS C. FRAINA

ADMISSION FREE

Auspices, Local Boston, Socialist Party

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRANA Editor
EADWEIN MACALPINE Associate Editor
Contributing Editors

SCOTT HEARING LUDWIG LORE
JOHN REED SUI KATAYAMA
N. J. HOSWICH G. WEINSTEIN

ISSUED EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY
By Local Boston, Socialist Party
225 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Saturday, December 7, 1918

Reconstructing Governments

THE Executive Committee of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council in Berlin has made a demand that the People's Commissaries dismiss Dr. Solf as Foreign Secretary. The recent "agreement" by which the Council usurped control of the Government as its "executive organ" evidently did not much alter things. The Spartacus Group and the Independent Socialists assert that Solf, Erzberger and associates are really blocking peace for Germany. These men are directly connected with the old regime, and justified the war. But to put these men out of the government and place in other representatives of their class would solve nothing, since the guilt of the war is not personal to a few individuals, but to the class that used war as an instrument of conquest and spoliation—the capitalist class. "Reconstructing" the government will still be a paltering with the revolutionary task, will still be retaining in power a bourgeois republic—hence the campaign of the Spartacus Socialists to annihilate the Provisional Government, and establish in its place a proletarian government—the dictatorship of the Soviets.

They Are Still There!

IN arguing that the Allies should refuse to negotiate peace with Germany if Bolshevism conquers and establishes a Socialist proletarian Government, the New York "Times" says editorially in its December 1 issue:

"President Wilson represents the American people, and the American people are not for the rule of any people by any one class. In Russia their troops are fighting against men who favor the government of the people by one class of the people for one class of the people, and they are fighting in alliance with Russian democrats."

When President Wilson made his declaration about "making the world safe for democracy," he had in mind the autocracy of Imperial Germany, "autocratic governments irresponsible to the will of the people." The Czar's government was just such an autocracy, and it was overthrown by the Russian people.

Is the Soviet government an autocracy? An autocracy is government by a ruling class holding in subjection and exploiting the majority of the people, government by a small clique either of the blood aristocracy or the money aristocracy, or a unity of both as in Germany and Great Britain. The Soviets are mass organizations of the workers and peasants; every useful producer participates and votes in the Soviets, and a majority may decide a new policy for the government. If a noble or bourgeois feels irresistibly the urge to become a citizen and participate in the Soviet Government, the process is a very simple one: secure some usefully useful employment, and the producer immediately becomes the citizen. Is this not superior to governments in which men "of blood" and of money, who perform no useful labor but escape upon the producers, participate and control legislation?

The "autocracy" of the Soviet Government has annihilated something new and magnificent in history. It has introduced industrial democracy. The workers control their jobs, are dominant in industry, the proceeds of industry are used for the happiness of the people and not the corrupting pleasures of the laborer parasites upon the people. The Soviet Government is so autocratic that it introduces democracy in industry! Surely this is not being. But precisely because the Soviet Republic introduces industrial democracy and annihilates Capitalism, the capitalist press characterizes it as autocracy.

Democracy to the capitalist means the rule of capital, the supremacy of the principle of ownership of the means of life by a small class; anything else is autocracy.

"In Russia their [the American people's] troops are fighting against men who favor the government of the people by one class of the people for one class of the people," says the "Times."

"We have no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of the Russian people," President Wilson and the Government have declared.

Which is the American policy? ... Allen troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok!

Love Your Enemy as Yourself

THE class struggle is international—that is the impressive teaching of recent events. The threat of Socialism unifies Capitalism. When the proletarian revolution conquered in Russia, the reactionary forces of Capitalism and Czarism eagerly invited the intervention of German troops, particularly in Finland and the Ukraine, as a means of crushing Socialism and the proletariat. Paul Milyukov, who was driven from the government because of his desire to fight Germany to the end and annex Constantinople and Galicia, concluded some months ago that Germany should be invited to intervene in Russia to crush Socialism. In Germany the forces of imperialism are using the threat of Allied intervention to prevent a proletarian revolution, and they are willing that their former enemy, the Allies, should if necessary march into the country to restore "order." And now comes Dr. Constantin Theodor Dumba, the unspeakable Dumba, former Ambassador to the United States, who was given his passports by the American Government, advocating that Great Britain and the United States send one regiment each into Austria as "a symbol of order," and perhaps as a symbol of more to come? And all this is usually to protect the "enemy." Particularly, Socialism, which is considered as against religion, apparently produces a religious renaissance in the ruling class when in conquest. An essential doctrine of Christianity is "love your enemy as yourself." While Socialism was a thing of the future, Milyukov & Co. did not love their enemy, Germany; Dumba and the reactionaries did not love the enemy Allies; but with the coming of Socialism, the religious fervor seizes them: Love your enemy as yourself.

Proletarian Dictatorship

THE revolutionary Socialists in Germany insist upon a dictatorship of the proletariat as the means equally of converting the revolution definitely into a proletarian revolution and of introducing Socialism. What is a dictatorship of the proletariat, what is its function in the Revolution and the coming of Socialism in Germany?

The dictatorship of the proletariat, the problem of power, is the determining issue of the Social Revolution. In the New York "Times" of December 1, William English Walling, the American caricature of Scheidemann, Sudekum, Thomas, Hyndman & Co., violently protests and warns against the dictatorship of the proletariat. He says:

"There is a large amount of satisfactory evidence that Liebknecht is pro-Bolshevist. Not only does he share many of the Bolshevist views, but he has brought about a regular defensive and offensive alliance between the German Revolutionaries and the Russian Bolsheviks. Liebknecht, toward the end of October, made a number of important speeches in Berlin, which are reported as follows by the *Vossische Zeitung*:

"Liebknecht's speeches were all absolutely Bolshevist. 'Now the proletariat is conscious of its power,' he said, 'the watchword is world revolution or world destruction. The call to the national defense should be answered by the dictatorship of the proletariat and by the overthrow of capitalist rule, thus establishing a Socialist Republic. If the Russian Soviet Republic be supported by the German Republic, then all countries will have to follow, and the world domination of the proletariat will begin.'"

It is clear, accordingly, that Liebknecht and the revolutionary Socialists insist upon a dictatorship of the proletariat. Walling continues:

"There are four distinct propositions in this speech: 1. German Russian revolutionary alliance, a world revolution a Socialist Republic for Germany and the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is only the last doctrine that is purely Bolshevist. The doctrine, which calls Bolshevism in Russia, becomes something absolutely different, however, in Germany. The industrial proletariat constitutes a minority in Russia of not more than 10% of the nation. By including certain agricultural elements the forces might be raised somewhat, but in any case it is a dictatorship of a minority. In fact, this is the only sense in the use of the word dictatorship. A majority does

not need to establish a dictatorship but can be satisfied with a democratic Constitutional Assembly. In Germany, on the contrary, the industrial proletariat constitutes something like half the population. For fear he could not get a majority immediately, Liebknecht proposes a temporary 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' But his whole past proves that he is wedded to the principle of majority rule. His doctrine is that he would have the majority rule—though by an industrial rather than a parliamentary government. Lenin, on the contrary, absolutely repudiates industrial democracy as well as every form of democracy and loses no occasion to say so. Lenin also expects to have the mass of the Russian peasantry with him, but only after a considerable period of dictatorship of the proletariat, sustained by force. That is the essential difference between Liebknecht and Lenin. Liebknecht does not expect to rule by force except for a very brief transition."

Walling draws simply an imaginary difference between Lenin and Liebknecht. Each proposes proletarian dictatorship for the transition period; the duration of this dictatorship depends largely upon the complexion of the international situation.

Nor is the theory of proletarian dictatorship a product of Bolshevism; it is a projection of Marxism. In his "Criticism of the Gotha Program" Marx said: The proletariat organizes itself as the ruling class, its state being the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. And in his introduction to Marx' "The Civil War in France," Engels points out to the bourgeoisie that the Paris Commune was a dictatorship of the proletariat. And the lesson of the Paris Commune, according to Marx, was that the proletariat cannot lay hold of the ready-made machinery of the bourgeois state and use it for its own purposes; a new state must be created. And this is the state of the organized producers functioning through a temporary revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

"Lenin does not believe in industrial democracy"—then why the expropriation of capital, why workers' control of industry, why the construction of an industrial state? These are all measures of industrial democracy, of Communist Socialism; and it is precisely this task of introducing industrial democracy that must be performed by the dictatorship of the proletariat.

All revolutions are minority revolutions, performed by a minority of the people. The bourgeois revolution was of this character; but it was still more a minority revolution in that it protected the interests of a minority class, the bourgeoisie. The proletarian revolution is a majority revolution in the sense that it promotes the interests of a majority class, the proletariat; but it is not, however, a majority revolution in the sense that a conscious majority necessarily performs the revolutionary task. The problem of the Revolution is bourgeois or proletarian rule, not majority or minority rule; that is a petty bourgeois conception. The antagonism between "majority" and "minority" is a fact only in a society based on class divisions.

In Russia the actual revolution was accomplished by the proletariat and peasantry, but it was a conscious minority of proletariat and peasantry sweeping into action the more backward sections of the people. According to all the evidence, the Soviet Government is a majority government; and still it is a dictatorship—against the counter-revolution, against the more backward sections of the people, against the bourgeoisie and capital. The bourgeois revolution ended in dictatorship—Cromwell, Napoleon; and even after the American Revolution—Washington was offered a crown, and Hamilton's party represented the tendency of dictatorship, the agrarian democracy alone preventing the realization of this dictatorship. The proletarian revolution ends in dictatorship, but where the bourgeois dictatorship perpetuates class rule and dictatorship, the purpose of a proletarian dictatorship is to destroy the old social relations creating class rule and dictatorship, and establish new relations under which these evils will cease to exist.

Capitalism is itself a dictatorship. It is, in theory, government of all the classes; in fact, it is government of one class, the class that controls industry, the class that has wealth and leisure, and consequently power. Bourgeois democracy is the form of authority of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat; its forms are calculated to prevent proletarian action, to centre all government power in the representatives of the bourgeoisie. It does not have to function through an armed dictatorship; but by means of its control of education, of the intellectuals, of the sources of information, of the factors for creating "pub-

lic opinion," supplemented by occasional use of armed force during strikes. Capitalism maintains itself as a government of one class.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a recognition of the fact that only one class in society counts, the working class; that it is the mission of this class to end class rule by annihilating the basis of class rule—the bourgeois control of industry. In the reconstruction of society on a Socialist basis, the proletariat alone is the dynamic force; all other classes are necessarily opposed to Socialism, and counter-revolutionary. A Constituent Assembly, accordingly, by instituting a "government of all the classes," acts against the coming of Socialism; and while in this government "Socialist" influence may be strong or even predominant, the government will gradually become more and more bourgeois, since the retention of bourgeois democracy, of bourgeois control of industry, of the parliamentary and other institutions of Capitalism will baffle proletarian action, will strengthen the control of the bourgeoisie, and the "government of all classes" becomes a government of one class—the predatory class of capital.

The proletarian revolution marks a complete break with the relations, social institutions and ideology of the past. It is a revolution that must penetrate deep into the basis of society and the ideology of the masses before it can conquer and assure the coming of Socialism. The bourgeois revolution was a small affair in comparison, since it produced no fundamental changes; social or economic; it was a political revolution, annihilating the class rule of Feudalism in order to establish the class rule of Capitalism. The ease with which the bourgeoisie adapted itself to a restoration of monarchy, in France and in England, or to the retention of monarchy as in Germany, proves the comparatively superficial transformations accomplished by the bourgeois revolution. The bourgeois revolution requires no fundamental ideological revolution: the ideology of master and slave remains under a new form. Nor does the bourgeois revolution have to be drastic, make a complete break with the past: it can adapt itself to remnants of the old order, or rather make these remnants adapt themselves to the new: and the compromise is made, assuring the supremacy of Capitalism.

But the proletarian revolution cannot compromise with the past: compromise means the inevitable coming into power of Capitalism again. Compromise is fatal. Either the bourgeoisie is completely annihilated, or it will gather its forces anew and annihilate Socialism and the proletariat. The proletarian revolution must conquer the bourgeoisie politically, expropriate it economically, create new social and industrial relations and a new ideology: it is a giant task. The antagonisms, the hatreds and the counter-revolutionary activity aroused by the proletarian revolution are consequently enormous: and enormous is the task of crushing the old order, a task requiring dictatorial and drastic methods, the full measure of the energy, the initiative and the power of the proletariat. The introduction of Socialism is the task of the Revolution in Germany; Socialism is realizable only through the class action of the proletariat,—the real revolution in Germany, accordingly, insists upon proletarian dictatorship as the only means of realizing its ideals.

The peculiar thing about this dictatorship of the proletariat, however, is that it functions democratically. A Soviet government is the most democratic form of government conceivable, based directly upon the producers in the factory and the field, a government that can be changed every three months, or within less time by the votes of its constituents. The citizens of the Soviet Republic are active agents of government. It is a dictatorship, moreover, that introduces industrial democracy, that ends the private ownership of the means of life, that destroys the old system where the worker was an industrial serf, and makes the workers the conscious masters of industry—and of their own life and destiny.

The use of force is incidental, and is characteristic of every revolution. The counter-revolution in Russia, and perhaps soon in Germany, resorts to force to crush the new Socialist state: force is answered by force. The dictatorship of the proletariat, however, is dynamic, not static; its every act is not to preserve itself as dictatorship, but to bring about those new relations of society in which dictatorship disappears. It is indeed a peculiar dictatorship that strives to transform itself into a superfluity!

The dictatorship of the proletariat, moreover, realizes that the forms of bourgeois democracy are incompatible with the task of the revolution-

ary proletariat; it annihilates bourgeois democracy and the parliamentary system. The concepts of bourgeois democracy in Russia were a fetter upon the action and emancipation of the proletariat; they are equally a fetter upon the revolutionary proletariat in Germany. Revolutionary Socialism there opposes the Constituent Assembly because it is an expression of bourgeois democracy, the organ of the Capitalist republic, assuring the supremacy of Capitalism and Imperialism. In annihilating Capitalism, Socialism in Germany must equally annihilate the "democracy" of Capitalism.

Either Constituent Assembly or dictatorship of the proletariat, either Capitalism or Socialism—that is the issue of the revolution in Germany, the decisive issue.

Revolutions and "Separatism"

THE "Socialist" Republic in Bavaria has threatened to break diplomatic relations with the rest of Germany unless the government grants certain measures, the dismissal of Dr. Solf and Erzberger, and the crushing of all counter-revolutionary elements. Concerning this threat of Bavarian Premier Eisner, Liebknecht in "The Red Flag" says:

"His threat of breaking off diplomatic relations will probably have a result that Eisner never intended. The reactionary elements in Bavaria and the rest of South Germany will find it easy to use his threat for counter-revolutionary purposes."

Eisner is de facto encouraging the separatist tendency in Bavaria. The Bavarian bourgeoisie is trying to absolve itself of all blame for causing the war, and is eager to make a "separate peace" with the Allies, imagining this will mean easier terms. This is one phase of the movement to declare Bavaria an independent Republic. But the fundamental factor in the "separatist" tendency, in spite of Eisner's immediately radical purpose, a Liebknecht-Haase Government, is that separatism is to act as a breakwater against the spread of revolutionary Socialism to Bavaria. The reaction and the counter-revolution in Bavaria, Silesia and the Rhine provinces are threatening secession if "proletarian dictation" persists in Berlin. Eisner is playing with fire. By publishing documents proving that the counter-revolutionary elements in Berlin conspired for war, Eisner promotes the revolution; by threatening a severance of diplomatic relations, he indirectly assists the bourgeois reaction. A revolutionary overthrow of the reactionary government—that is the tactic necessary.

Immediately upon the development of revolution in Austria-Hungary, Hungary, that is to say, the Hungarian ruling class, declared itself an independent republic, a measure calculated to stem the tide of Social Revolution by misdirecting the energy of the masses into the sterile channels of national independence.

In Russia during the Revolution, the landowners, bourgeoisie and petty bourgeois Socialists of the Ukraine separated from Soviet Russia to prevent the Bolsheviks from conquering in the Ukraine and get "easier" peace terms. Wherever counter-revolution raises its head in Russia, it immediately organizes an "independent republic"—of the Don, of the Caucasus, of Siberia.

In this separatist tendency, the bourgeoisie arouses old racial antagonisms which have long since lost all meaning, and tries by this method to create antagonism against the Socialist Republic, split the proletariat and misdirect its energy. This is precisely the tendency of bourgeois separatism in Bavaria.

In Russia there was a reason for the separatist tendency. Russia was a conglomeration of nationalities, not as yet assimilated because of the brutal, stupid nature of Czarism. The Bolshevik policy, accordingly, was to grant these nationalities the full right of secession, depending upon the proletarian class struggle to conquer and unite the Russian nationalities on a new basis—that of a federated Socialist Republic. A Socialist Russia would have a powerful attraction for the proletariat in Finland, in Poland, in the Ukraine; and by means of this the different nationalities would be amalgamated into one republic.

But in Germany there is no such reason. Germany has long since been unified into one nation, except in Prussian Poland, Schleswig, subject territory. But as the bourgeoisie favored national unity to accomplish its "manifest destiny" of becoming powerful and predatory, so now this bourgeoisie in Bavaria and Silesia would break the unity of Germany if Socialism conquers, in order to protect its "manifest destiny." Separatism is necessarily an instrument of the counter-

revolutionary bourgeoisie and agrarian aristocracy, in Germany as in Russia.

But as the success of Socialism in Prussia develops a separatist tendency among the Bavarian and Silesian bourgeoisie and agrarian aristocracy, it simultaneously develops a "unifying" tendency among the Bavarian workers and peasants, who, under the pressure of events, will see their interests realized in a unified Socialist Germany as a preliminary to a unified Socialist United States of Europe.

The separatist tendency in Bavaria and Silesia, the tendency for national independence in Austria-Hungary and the Slav races, all are expressions of the developing class struggle. Clearly, the interests of the workers and peasants of Germany, of Austria, of Bohemia, of Poland, of Galicia are not promoted by "national independence"—national independence for small states is a mockery under the conditions of Imperialism; but by means of federation in a Socialist Republic. The bourgeois cry of national independence in South-eastern Europe is directly counter-revolutionary; the workers and peasants must unite with Soviet Russia, with the oncoming Socialist Germany.

A revolution lets loose two sets of forces, one centripetal, the other centrifugal, one scatters, the other unifies. The proletarian revolution in Germany necessarily, at first, scatters, disintegrates the old national unity: the impact of the class struggle produces disintegration of the old, an apparent end of all things, "anarchic disorder." But as under conditions of revolution the forces of the bourgeoisie are centripetal, so the forces of the proletariat are centrifugal. The proletarian revolution conquers, and unifies again, on a new and higher basis. The separatist tendency is incidental a temporary instrument of counter-revolution.

Bolshevikjabs

NOW that peace is declared Mr. Gompers again assumes a belligerent attitude. Speaking at a "jubilee" meeting of the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, though what that unfortunate organization has got to be jubilant about is shrouded in mystery, the redoubtable Sammy breathes fire and devastation in a manner calculated to give the bloated plutocrats the shivers until he announces that he has no intention of turning to any "patented panacea for all the ills of human kind," and then our friend the capitalist settles back comfortably in his seat assured once more that "all's right with the world."

We are indebted to our old and trusted friend, the bourgeois press, for the latest confidential inside information regarding affairs in the poor old Emerald Isle. It appears that the Kaiser is to be offered a haven of refuge in Ireland. When we search our memory there appears only one place in Ireland that could fittingly be set apart to receive such a distinguished visitor—from the number of English Lords that have, from time to time, graced its halls and from its general historical associations, Dublin Castle seems to be just the place for Mr. Hohenzollern.

"Ex-Kaiser Blames Russia for the War," says a newspaper headline. Well, taking everything into consideration, it is more than we expected of Wilhelm that he would be so considerate as to blame somebody that couldn't be punished, but, still, in fairness to the late ex-Czar, we would say that if he did start the war he never intended that it should go so far.

Field Marshal Von Hindenburg has issued an order in which he states that "no offense will be taken at the display of the red flag." We await with eagerness for the German Socialists to tender a vote of thanks to the doughty soldier for his kindly consideration.

Who would ever have thought that Hindenburg would outdo our mayors in the matter of toleration? Human nature's wonderful!

"Dutch to decide Wilhelm's status," says a news item. Might we offer the suggestion that the unknown quantity is decidedly X.

"Congress Cool to President" says the headlines. From the fact that none of the much heralded Republican heckling materialized it would not be unfair to assume that the coolness was chiefly of the pedal extremities.

King Nicholas I of Montenegro has been deposed. Another "ad" in the situations wanted column.

The Quality of Clemency

RECENT developments in the Mooney case clearly demonstrate two things, both of which are of supreme importance to the workers of this country: that the forces of Capitalism are relentless and that these same forces only understand one language—the language of power.

For two and a half years the Mooney case has been prominently before the public, not only of the United States but of the entire world. It is no exaggeration to say that, with the exception of the Dreyfus case in France, no other case has been so widely discussed. The working class of Russia, England, Ireland, Italy, and Holland has taken an active interest in the case and asked that a new trial be granted. Public opinion throughout America has long been on the side of the accused. In spite of this wave of protest the capitalist interests have persisted in their endeavor to silence the voice of this man who spoke against the wrongs perpetrated on his brothers by the system on which these interests batten.

Mooney was convicted and condemned to death. The case was appealed to the State Supreme Court and while the appeal was still pending the perjury of one of the prosecution's chief witnesses was revealed. This additional evidence was laid before the Supreme Court but was rejected on a legal technicality and the appeal accordingly denied. The governor was then appealed to for pardon, in order that the case might be retried on a new count, and in the meantime the case was carried to the United States Supreme Court.

From the breakdown of the prosecution's chief witness it was evident that the whole case was a frame-up, the character of the witnesses was such that the prosecution's case against the three remaining defendants fell through. It was proved by the defense that the underworld had been scoured to find human beings vile enough to swear away Mooney's life for a paltry bribe, that, in addition to bribery, force became necessary before even these drags of society could be persuaded to testify, and that the whole case was the work of the interests whom Mooney, in his capacity as an organizer of labor and a fighter for the common good, had defied. Yet the governor of one of the greatest states in the union was silent in answer to the appeal that he step forward and cry halt to this crime against the workers.

The Supreme Court spoke with the voice of reaction and with its decision an interesting fact was brought to light which it would be well for the masses of the people to consider carefully, viz: that the judicial system at present operating can convict but cannot rectify, at least in the case where the interests of the working class are at stake; that justice is all a matter of time and record and that no subsequent happenings can alter its mandate.

Such a judiciary ceases to be a tribunal of justice and becomes an instrument of tyranny. The Spanish Inquisition, the English Star Chamber, could, at least, liberate their victims when mistakes were proven, but not so our present legal system. Its decisions are unalterable unless cer-

tain specific records show the mistake. It would be interesting to know whether the Supreme Court of the United States could take cognizance of a confession by the real criminal or whether Mooney would still have to suffer because forsooth, the confession was not in the trial records—or because he is a representative of the despised working class?

When the decision of the court became known the workers decided that they would strike in order to prevent the imposition of the death sentence upon which, without more ado, executive "clemency" was extended to Mooney to the end that instead of instant death by hanging he should suffer slow death by imprisonment.

The theory of justice, as advanced by its apologists, is that an accused remains innocent until he is proven guilty, that guilt must be established beyond a reasonable doubt, and that once guilt is so established the law must take its course unless some mitigating circumstances are introduced.

In accordance with this theory there are no grounds upon which clemency should be extended to Mooney. He is convicted of deliberately planning and executing the cold-blooded slaughter of a number of innocent people, people he did not know, and who under no conceivable circumstances could be held responsible for giving him offense.

Governor Stephens in graciously granting "clemency" says: "There are certain features connected with it [the evidence in the case] which convince me that the extreme sentence should not be executed." The only "features" that could have any bearing on the case are those which would throw a reasonable doubt upon the guilt of the accused and under the law, which Governor Stephens has sworn to uphold, those "features" would void the whole sentence and set Mooney free. There is no middle course in this case; either Mooney's guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt or it is not. In the former case the governor of the State of California, according to the laws of that state, should not interfere, in the latter case Mooney should go free.

The governor also speaks of reviewing "certain developments following the conviction." What are these "certain developments"? The San Francisco "Call" on November 22, several days before the Governor extended "clemency", printed nearly seven pages of "certain developments" under the heading: "Fickert is Trapped by U. S. Dictaphone," which it takes from the report of J. B. Densmore, U. S. Director-General of Employment, to Secretary of Labor Wilson.

In summing up his report, which is chiefly the transcript of conversations between Fickert, the District Attorney in the case, and his associates obtained by means of a dictaphone placed in the Fickert's private office, Mr. Densmore says:

"For the purpose of this report no further transcript of these dictaphone conversations is deemed necessary. It can readily be understood that merely to pile up a multiplicity of incidents

of the same general character would be a work of supererogation, lending increased bulk to an already long report without adding either to its strength or its lucidity. In other words, it is not the object of the present investigation to see how many instances of frameup can be laid to the account of the district attorney; what is important is the quality, rather than the mere amount of evidence adduced, and for this reason one authenticated case will serve as well as a hundred.

"The record establishes three sets of facts, each one of which has a bearing upon the question at issue, namely, whether Mooney and his fellow defendants received a fair trial at the hands of the district attorney. These three sets of facts are:

"First—That Fickert is in constant association with men and interests of such a nature as to render it incredible that he should be either impartial or honest in the conduct of a case of this nature: that he is and has been for some time past co-operating with notorious jury and case fixers; that, for instance, he is equally guilty with Pete McDonough in conspiring to free a wealthy man charged with crimes of degeneracy; and that he has also been working with the same notoriously corrupt McDonough and Ben Selig to save from conviction Dave Blaine, an automobile tire thief. These cases are mentioned simply to illustrate his common practice, of which abundant evidence is furnished by this report.

"Second—That Fickert and his associates have within the past month framed, and conspired to frame, cases with which it was his sworn duty to deal impartially.

"Third—That Fickert and his associates, within the past month, have conspired to fabricate evidence with which to convict Mrs. Mooney; and that to this end they have attempted, in the grossest manner, to intimidate and blackmail a prospective woman witness.

"It will be apparent that these facts, which are all brought out exhaustively in the present report, tend to supplement the revelations already made in the Oxman letters, and that they confirm the impression, made unavoidably by the weak and conflicting nature of the testimony in the bomb case, that practically the whole of Fickert's case against Mooney, Billings and Mrs. Mooney was made to order."

The "certain developments" that lead Mr. Densmore to the conclusions above stated lead the governor to commute Mooney's sentence to life imprisonment. Such "clemency" is an insult to the workers of this country and above all it is an insult to Mooney, whose only crime is that he loves his fellowman.

The threat of the workers produced "clemency". The execution of that threat will bring freedom to Mooney and save the organized labor movement of this country from lasting shame and disgrace.

Mooney has already lain too long in jail. Execute the threat. Speak in the terms of your economic might. Set Mooney free.

Socialism—the Hope of all Sides

RANT as they may, the apologists of Capitalism must face the unpleasant fact that Socialism is the predominant factor in all the changes that are at present writing the pages of history. Even where revolution is not marching on to action Socialism holds the center of the stage.

In Russia where the proletarian revolution has conquered power, Socialism is definitely in the ascendancy, and in Germany where the masses are beginning their march to the final assault on the citadel of power, Socialism is the driving power behind the marchers. But before the Russian workers dominated the scene Socialism became the fad of the day, even as now it is the rage in Germany.

The reactionaries, caught in the swirl of revolution, cast about for some means to stem the rising waters. Liberals were rushed into the limelight, as evidence of the rebirth of one time autocrats, and as quickly rushed into the outer darkness, when it was found that the liberal stage had been swept away with autocracy. "Friends of the people" were held up to the public gaze only to be speedily pulled down and at last Socialists were placed in supreme power and everyone became a "Socialist."

"Socialists" and "Socialism" became the one hope of the reactionaries. Out of the wreck of autocracy on the rock of the people's will something must be saved, and only Socialists and Socialism could save it. Thus began the array of

"Socialists" that for a time held the outside world in awe of the stupendous change. Kerensky, Tsereteli, Skobelev, Tchernov, mouthed Socialistic platitudes about moderation, coalition, evolution, just as today in Germany Ebert, Haase, Scheidemann hold the center of the stage and sing the same songs.

In the countries where the masses of the people are not in action Socialism is also the dominant factor. In France "Socialists" rise to high places in the government. Briand, Viviani, Guesde are names to conjure with. In England although the highest peaks of governmental fame are not, as yet, marked by the feet of "Socialists" yet the high valleys, the foothills of fame, are thronged with "Socialists": Henderson, McDonald, Barnes, Hyndman, Clynes. High official circles in Holland have a bowing acquaintance with Troelstra. Italy's Capitalism looks with favor on Bissolati, Mussolini, d'Ambrosi. The best people in Belgium smile benignly on LeNain, Vandervelde, La Fontaine. From Australia Hughes and his friends, sit at the council tables of the mighty, while kings and foreign potentates dine and wine with Gompers, Bohn and Spargo.

Strange as it may appear all these "Socialists" have not fought for their prominence; greatness was thrust upon them. They are the welcome guests of the world's elite, and yet they are "Socialists."

While all these pleantries are being exchanged

the masses of the world's disinherited are also slowly, but surely, turning to Socialism. And for them Socialism means a clean sweep—a complete overthrow of the present system of society and in its place the establishment of a new order. As the bourgeois Socialists lounge round the tables of the old autocrats, they lose hold on the masses.

In Russia, for a time, Kerensky played the march of progress but events forced him to take a definite stand and when he was revealed as the friend of the old order, the people rose, and in their wrath swept him into the outer darkness for all time. In Germany the situation is paralleled. The advocates of moderation, the disciples of the patchwork theory, rise to power, but the masses begin to move and compromise follows compromise until, like Kerensky, they and the system they desire to mend will vanish in obscurity.

Socialism is a two edged sword. It sweeps forward and backward; backward, cutting all connection with the past, forward, clearing the way for the new order.

The reactionary forces may flirt with Socialism, may dangle "Socialism" and "Socialists" before the eyes of the people, but the vivid history of the past two years proves that such paltering is fruitless. Once the people glimpse their power they are invincible. With incredible swiftness the mass, so long blind, sweeps the scales away from its eyes, and after the first dazzling glare of the light is over, it sees with amazing clarity.

The Fundamentals of Bolshevism

N. I. Hourwich

IN considering the greatest of revolutions—the Bolshevik proletarian revolution in Russia—it is appropriate to attempt to give at least a short characterization of Bolshevism, of that political faith—one might say, philosophic conception of the world—which is destined to play a role of the first importance, as recent events in Europe indicate, not only in the Russian, but in the coming world Socialist Revolution.

Brief characterizations, limited to "formulas," which are, perhaps, suited to a text book, are, generally speaking, insufficient, superficial and inexact. But if, in spite of this, we should give such a brief definition of the nature of Bolshevism, we would reduce it, in our opinion, to the following two fundamental characteristic traits: Bolshevism, or to be more exact, the Bolshevik Party, is first of all a party of revolutionary action, a party of dynamic Socialism, if we may express it that way. The direct object, the constant aim of this revolutionary activity of the Bolshevik or Communist Party—the basis equally of its programme and of its tactics, is a revolutionary seizure of power by the proletariat, the realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as an inevitable and necessary condition for the accomplishment of the transition from Capitalism to Socialism.

Inflexible, knowing no periods of weakness and no compromise, waging the proletarian class struggle towards the revolutionary seizure of complete governmental power, a class struggle which puts above everything else its final revolutionary aims, and by these measuring all daily activities—such is a brief characterization of what is known as Bolshevik theory, or the Bolshevik Party—the left revolutionary wing of the former Russian Social Democratic Labor Party.

For anyone who is acquainted with the elements of scientific Socialism and the Socialist movement in different countries, there is nothing new or specifically "Russian" in these characteristics. He will recognize in them the familiar features of revolutionary Marxism which has stepped out of the bulky volumes and become realized in life. Bolshevism is revolutionary preaching translated into revolutionary deeds.

At the dawn of the history of the Russian Social Democracy, during the period of its formation into a political party, when it faced organizational problems first of all, this revolutionary nature of Bolshevism found its expression in the demand for a strictly centralized organization.

"We are, essentially, a party of revolutionary action, not merely of revolutionary education prepared for many years to come"—this was the reply usually given by the Bolsheviks to the Mensheviks, who were demanding more "democratic" organization. "Our foe, Capitalism, and its chief instrument in its struggle against us—the governmental machine—are powerful just because of their centralism. If we intend to defeat this enemy of ours, if we desire to bring our struggle to a successful revolutionary seizure of the state power, we should be equally centralized, demo-

cratically centralized, and equally united by a common will, which is being changed through democratic discipline into unity of action. The difference is only in the character of that centralism: While capitalist centralism is autocratic, the centralism of the suppression of the will of the majority by a 'united minority,' our organization centralism should be the democratic centralism of a 'united majority.' But we must not sacrifice Socialism, the true democracy of tomorrow; we must not sacrifice the successful struggle for Socialism for the deceptive, painted 'democracy' of today, of our organization."

"We must learn how to combine together the meeting democracy of the toiling masses, full of spring's stormy nature, with iron discipline," says Lenin in his brochure, "The Problems of the Soviet Government." This combination of democracy with centralism, of democracy with iron discipline, is not merely a problem for the proletariat during the period of realization of its dictatorship, but equally a necessary condition of achieving this dictatorship.

"Democratic centralism"—such was the organization "formula" advanced by the Bolsheviks during the period of 1903.

And in this seemingly "insignificant" organization problem, the general revolutionary proletarian nature of Bolshevism expressed itself. The nearsighted philistines, the middle-class ideologists of "small deeds," who because of the trees see not the wood, may assure us that the "original controversy between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks was of an insignificant, certainly not of a fundamental character." . . . A more thoughtful and penetrating thinker will already recognize in this apparently insignificant controversy the embryonic elements of those vital, fundamental differences which now in some countries have already, and in others are about to, split the Socialist parties into two uncompromising camps—revolutionary Socialists and the hopeless opportunists, the social patriots, social-reformers and all sort of social insipids.

In the "insignificant" slogans of organization advanced by the Bolsheviks as early as 1903, are to be found already the elements of that great slogan, dictatorship of the proletariat, which was introduced by them later in 1905, and, finally, accomplished in the form of the Soviet Government in 1917.

The attitude on this question was characteristic of the two factions of the former Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, the latter of whom have now finished their circle of development by a union with the Czar's generals and international imperialists.

True to the revolutionary problems of the proletariat, aware of the dynamic role which the proletariat was fated to play in the coming revolution, the Bolsheviks stood for participation in the provisional revolutionary government. And then they advanced their slogan—dictatorship of the

proletariat and the proletarian peasantry.

"It would require gigantic efforts of revolutionary energy in all advanced classes in order to defend the conquests of the revolution," wrote Lenin in the "Vpered" in 1905; and this "defend" is nothing than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry! The provisional revolutionary government (the government of workers and peasants) was put forward by the Bolsheviks as a means to realize the slogan of "dictatorship" in revolutionary activity. Later this revolutionary government assumed the form of the Soviets.

The Mensheviks at that period would have risen against any such participation in the provisional government, considering that it would be "inadmissible for a party of Social Democrats to commit such vulgarity of a Jaures type;" as regards the revolutionary slogan, "long live the revolutionary government," the organ of the Mensheviks at that time, "Iskra," instructively wrote: the combination of the words "long live" and "government" is a blasphemy.

Only 13 years have passed, and the revolutionary events in Russia gave us the opportunity of judging the real counter-revolutionary substance of this fraudulent "uncompromising" of the Mensheviks. The participation of workers and peasants in a revolutionary government they considered as "vulgar Jauresism," but participation in all sorts of counter-revolutionary coalition governments—this . . . they found to be their "sacred duty." A revolutionary coalition of workers and peasants for the purpose of defending a democratic revolution—is "inadmissible," is an "unconscious betrayal of the interests of the proletariat!" But a union with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie for the purpose of crushing the proletarian government, is . . . "saving the revolution!"

Thus, in the revolutionary stress of events, which has forged into "a steel sword" the true revolutionary slogans of some, the empty chatter of others has scattered into its counter-revolutionary fragments.

"Give me the fulcrum and I will overturn the whole universe," exclaimed Archimedes once upon a time.

"Give me the proletarian dictatorship and I will overturn the capitalist world, the world of slavery and tears, and on its ruins I will build the glorious commonwealth of freedom and happiness, the Socialist society!"—says now the revolutionary proletariat rallying under the banner of Bolshevism.

From democratic centralism in organization, as a means of promoting the final revolutionary aims of the proletariat, to the dictatorship of the proletariat; from the position of a faction of a "seditions" revolutionary party, to the role of "governmental party" in the first Socialist republic on earth—such is the course of development, the sweep made by revolutionary Socialism—Bolshevism in Russia.

The Struggle in Australia

WHILE little is heard from the Commonwealth of the antipodes events are marching with incredible swiftness there. Australia is commonly supposed to be a workingman's paradise owing to the fact that the labor unions virtually control the country, but the Socialistic tendencies of the Australian government exists much more in the imagination than in reality. It is true that the labor unions do control the government to a considerable extent, but, when it is remembered that the present premier is a product of such control, Socialists may well pause to enquire as to the real nature of the labor unions.

The rapprochement between capital and labor in Australia has been found to be the complete failure that marks its advent everywhere. The unions, founded on a craft basis, are the instruments of the workers insofar as they make for shorter hours and what is euphemistically termed a "fair day's wage for a fair day's work," but outside of these and kindred sops the masses of the people in Australia are in the same position as elsewhere. The control of the unions is merely the control that any fairly well organized body of voters exercise over the political state.

It is not surprising that under these conditions the revolutionary section of the working class, in the land of the Kangaroo, have turned their attention more and more to industry and less and less to politics. It was this tendency that resulted in

the heavy sentences imposed on the twelve advocates of industrial unionism some time ago. The Australian arm of the Industrial Workers of the World had for some time previous been very active in their advocacy of the One Big Union, but it was not until they turned their attention to the unions, themselves, and worked within these bodies in favor of the more revolutionary form of unionism that they began to make the weight of their agitation felt. While they constituted a weak minority they were left to carry on their propaganda in comparative peace, but with their rise to power the "labor government" adopted the same attitude that the interests of Capitalism everywhere assume towards those who threaten their safety. The I. W. W. became anathema, the press waged the same campaign of vilification against the organization that it has elsewhere.

But with the jailing of the leaders the propaganda, as has been the case elsewhere, received an impetus instead of a setback, and now comes the report that the majority of the big unions in the state of New South Wales has decided to adopt the industrial form of organization and that the indications are that the unions in Victoria will shortly follow suit. The leaders of the industrialists are frank in their statements that when they have accomplished the industrial form of organization they will then wage war against the capitalist system, or to quote from a newspaper

dispatch "make repeated assaults upon the citadel of Capitalism, choosing our own time and our own battlefields, culminating in one gigantic struggle between the organized forces of capital and labor, when, if successful, we will then be able to take control of industry and establish the Socialist Commonwealth."

At the beginning of the war in Australia, as was the case in all the countries involved, the Socialist and Labor movements split on the question of war. One section of the party broke away and called itself the National Labor Party. This body fused with the liberals and together they succeeded in riding into office.

But gradually they lost favor, and the Official Labor Party dominates the field. It is this section, in alliance with the Socialists, who favor the establishment of the One Big Union. Among the "simon pure" political actors, who have labored so long to unite capital and labor, the New South Wales decision spells disaster as it means relegating politics to a secondary place.

To further quote a news dispatch one of the industrial leaders says: "The political arm of labor must always depend, to be successful at elections, upon the unattached vote of the middle man, the moderates of the community. Therefore the political wing of the movement is in reality governed by the moderates. It cannot reach, by the very nature of things, to labor's final goal."

Chapters from My Diary

By Leon Trotsky

III

The Swiss Social Democracy.—"Gruetli."—"Eintracht."—Fritz Platten.—My German Pamphlet: "The War and the International."—Socialist Appendages to the General Staff.

SWISS Socialism is bound by ties of language on the one hand to the Socialism of Germany and on the other to that of France. It was entirely natural that the crisis in these two powerful Socialist parties should at once express itself in Switzerland, enclosed as the country is on all sides by the fires of war. The struggle was mirrored all the more fiercely due to the fact that the Swiss social-patriots were naturally attracted by the contradictory centres of gravitation, the German side and the French side. In this connection the following case of political symmetry is rather characteristic. In the Swiss Parliament there sit two deputies with identical family names and identical Christian names; they are Johann Sieg, of Zurich, and Jean Sieg, of Geneva. Both are social-patriots, but Johann Sieg is an outright Germanophile, while Jean Sieg is a still more outright Francophile. Under these circumstances the internationalist policy of the Socialist Party would seem to be the unified middle ground of self-preservation. The international position met with very general favor in the ranks of the party (and it was my privilege in those days to attend many party meetings), but this was not the case in the party leadership.

The support of the right national wing of the party was clearly the "Gruetli" organization, that well-known body out of which the Swiss Socialist Party sprang. The most warlike nationalist of this body was found to be the former pastor Pfueger, one of the party's representatives in the Federal Parliament. "If I were the German Emperor," he declared at one of the party meetings, in which the first dispute with respect to the war was being carried on, "I also should have stood by with drawn sword to oppose the Russian!" Months later, Pfueger repeated the same sentence at the Party Congress at Berne, but, unfortunately for him, his eloquent oratory did not produce the desired effect; there arose a great noise, laughter, whistling, hisses, and the unhappy candidate for the post of German Emperor found himself unable to finish his speech.

The focus of the left wing was the organization known as "Eintracht," which was recruited almost exclusively from among the foreigners: Germans, Austrians, Russians, etc. Of real Swiss Socialists in this organization, the most active was Fritz Platten, Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Party. He was of tall stature, with a frank, open face, an excellent popular orator, himself a proletarian by birth and by his mode of life, although he was married to a Russian student. Platten represents, in himself, one

of the doubtless most engaging personalities in the Swiss Social Democracy. "What a disgrace," he said at these first meetings, "that the workers should again have bent their backs in this critical moment. But I hope that they will yet show, before this war is over, that they know how to die, not only in the service of others, but also for themselves." And from Platten's lips these are not phrases. In 1905, when the Revolution broke out in Russia, Fritz, then a young man of twenty, decided to take active part in it, journeyed to Riga, fought in the first ranks, and acquired at first hand a thorough acquaintance with the inside of Russian jails. In 1912 he stood at the head of the general strike in Zurich, as one of its most determined and most influential leaders.

Already in September, 1914, the "Eintracht" Executive Committee worked out an aggressive internationalist manifesto, and invited the "leaders" of the party to a constituent meeting, at which I was to defend the manifesto in a lecture. But the "leaders" did not show up: they considered it too risky to take a definite position in such a delicate question, preferring a passive waiting attitude, and limiting themselves to an academic criticism of the patriotic "extravagances" of the German and French Socialists. This, by the way, is the political mentality that is most frequently found in all the Socialist circles of the neutral countries, the United States among them: in fact it is more outspoken here than anywhere else. [This was written about one month before America's entry into the war.]

The "Eintracht" association almost unanimously passed the adoption of the resolution, which was subsequently published in the Socialist press and served as a serious stimulus to the public opinion of the party.

At the Party Congress at Berne, to which reference had been already made, an address on the war was delivered by Judge Otto Lang. The tone of the lecture was that of a very moderate internationalism, approaching the present position of Kautsky. But the attitude of the majority of the Congress was incomparably more determined than that of the lecturer. In fact, in general, in the time of the war, the Swiss Party accomplished a swift maneuver to the left, with the result that a considerable section of the Gruetli people were left high and dry, and were thus obliged to form an independent reformist and social-patriotic party. In this fact, it may be mentioned by the way, is another plain illustration of the extremely profound gulf that separates social patriotism from internationalism.

My stay in Switzerland was, as far as I was concerned, taken up chiefly with my work on my pamphlet, written in German, entitled "The International and the War." The pamphlet arose out of my diary, into which I entered, during the first few weeks, at first only for my own use, an

attempt to elucidate the causes of the catastrophe of the Socialist parties, as well as the modes of escape from the catastrophe. Platten undertook the task of distributing the pamphlet, and saw to it that several thousand copies were forwarded to Germany and Austria. At this time, I was already in France, and read with astonishment in one of the French papers a telegram reporting that a German judge had sentenced me, in absentia, to a prison term for having written the pamphlet. I must confess that the Hohenzollern judge, in thus sentencing me to a term which I have not shown undue haste in serving, did me a favor that was quite valuable. To the social-patriotic fabricators and "ideological" scribbles of the Alexinsky type, this sentence by a German court, pronounced on me, will be a hard nut to crack when they turn their distinguished talents in the direction of proving that I am at bottom an agent of the German General Staff.

The French Customs, in their turn, held up the package of pamphlets that had been sent from Switzerland, and informed me that the pamphlet would be confiscated because of their German original (!). One of my Russian friends informed Gustave Herve about this, and Gustave Herve at that time still had his moments of oppositional spirit, and in "La Guerre Sociale," Herve's paper, there appeared a satirical note directed against the confiscation of this "anti-German" pamphlet. For this or for some other reason, the Customs delivered to me, a few days later, the package that they had held up.

It is hardly necessary to say that the German social-patriotic press attempted, on its part, to reveal the author of the pamphlet as a secret patriot and a defender of the interests of the Allies. What is the relative proportion of conscious misrepresentation and of chauvinistic fanaticism in accusations of this type? It would not be easy to determine. At any rate, so much is certain: Social patriotism debases men morally and mentally to such an extent that they are prevented from seeing in a Socialist simply a Socialist and nothing more. When two feudal serfs met on the road they would ask each other: "Whose man are you?"—"I belong to Sheremetyeff."—"And we belong to Bobrinsky."—Evidently the feudal notion of "belonging" to somebody is deeply anchored in the breasts of the social patriots. The interests of which general staff does he defend? The Romanoff master or the Hohenzollern master? These people are beginning to lose the ability to see that it is possible to be an enemy of all "masters" at once, to follow one's own flag, and to feel one's self,—to use Fritz Adler's beautiful expression—a soldier in "the eternal army of social revolution."

The latest number of the internationalist gazette, "Nachalo," arriving from Paris, brings the news that this former social-democrat of the Second Duma has been dismissed even from the personnel of the not over-fastidious social-patriotic paper "Prizyv".

Alien Democracy in Russia

By Gregory Weinstein

particular in their choice of means, while fighting Socialist Russia.

The Allied plan of "liberating" Russia by a simultaneous attack on her both from the north and the Far East, has evidently failed. Both expeditions have made very little progress.

The Archangel expedition, according to the latest war bulletins from the Murman front, has brought nothing but great sacrifices and want to the invading troops. While in the Far East differences have arisen among the Allies themselves. Besides, the Samara-Ufa-Omsk-Vladivostok "government" has not justified their expectations. Even the Czecho-Slovaks, who have been made so happy by being made a present of their "independence" by the Allies, even they have turned ingrate and want to return to their own country as soon as possible.

Thus the plan had to be altered somewhat, some "corrections" had to be made. Probably such "corrections" have been the coups d'etat of Kiev and Omsk.

Undoubtedly, with the seizure of the Dardanelles the Allies will not fail to utilize the way thus made open to the Black Sea ports, in order to attack Russia from the south. News of the landing of Allied troops in Odessa has already been reported, and the other

A few days ago reports reaching the United States told of two "coups d'etat" which took place almost simultaneously in two different parts of Russia—Kiev and Omsk. In the former case Hetman Skoropadsky's government was deposed, a government forced upon the Ukrainian people by the German imperialists; in the latter case the Social-Revolution-Cadet coalition, bearing the high-sounding name of a "directorate" and one time having apparently the "Allied sympathy" on its side, was put out of business.

The coups have certain common characteristics. In both cases the coups d'etat were led by the ex-Czar's generals: in Kiev—by General Denikine, in Omsk—by the former commander of the Black Fleet—Admiral Kolchak. Moreover, the two coups, if we are to judge from the newspaper comments, were approved by international imperialism.

Should the latter assumption prove to be correct—and there is little doubt that such is the case—we have before us a picture of a touching union between the western "democracies" and the servants of Russian Czarism. Indeed, there is nothing extraordinary in such a union. It would merely bring the Allied policy, as regards Russia, to its logical conclusion, and once more prove that the "exponents of democracy and self-determination of nationalities" are not very par-

ticular in their choice of means, while fighting Socialist Russia.

Generally speaking, the Allies need their own men in Kiev and also in Ukraine. But what are the elements with whom a contact should be effected in order to form an aggressive league to fight the Bolsheviks? Surely, it cannot be Hetman Skoropadsky who has so outrageously compromised himself by his union with the Prussian Junkers. Hence, it has become necessary to make use of one of the former Czar's generals, who has been all the time operating in the south of Russia.

On the other hand, it has become necessary for the Allies to cut the complicated Siberian knot, at any cost. The Omsk directorate has become too complex, unworkable and what is more important, an impotent piece of machinery. It has become urgent to have a strong hand, a military dictator who could at least successfully grapple with the passive resistance offered by the Siberian population to intervention. And again the choice naturally falls on a military tool of Czarism.

Are the Allies becoming "practical" politicians? Are they turning into restorers of the old despotic regime?

Debs and Moyer—A Page of American Labor History

THE following open letter of Eugene V. Debs is a flash into American labor history and the character of the A. F. of L.

Terre Haute, Ind., November 16th, 1918.
Chas. H. Moyer.

President Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers,
Denver, Colo.

Dear Sir:

In the press dispatch in this morning's papers reporting the proceedings of the Pan-American Labor Conference now being held at Laredo, you are reported as having said that the A. F. of L. saved your life and the lives of Haywood and Pettibone twelve years ago, that you are now endeavoring to repay that organization for having saved your life and that Pettibone on his death-bed acknowledged his gratitude to said organization.

Upon reading this statement by you which contains other matter along the same line, I at once sent the following telegram to Laredo:

"Louis N. Morones,

Vice-Chairman Pan-American Labor Conference,
Laredo, Texas.

Be not deceived by Moyer's statement. He is now training with the Federation skirns that wanted him hung twelve years ago and maligning the men who saved his life. If you want the truth I can furnish it and dare Gompers to face me and deny it. Eugene V. Debs."

I now write to you direct to ask you if you made this statement and if you did I want to brand it for what you know it to be, as an absolute falsehood. But before passing final judgment I wish to give you full opportunity to say what you have to say in your defense. If you have been misrepresented I shall be glad to know it, but if you have been truthfully reported I want you known for what you are in the labor movement.

Time was when I had full confidence in you and held you in respect, but I confess to have some doubt as to your integrity after hearing reports concerning you and your performances as a union leader from apparently trustworthy sources. Still, I would give you the benefit of every doubt and it would afford me far greater satisfaction to have you clear yourself and stand forth as the man I have believed you to be than to see you, like so many others with whom you are now in close affiliation, corrupted and dishonored for the sake of hanging on to an official job and selling your very soul for a mess of pottage.

If you stood before that conference at Laredo and made the statement above quoted you know that you uttered a deliberate untruth, an untruth so flagrant that it should have stuck in your

throat and made you blush scarlet with shame.

You know as well as I do what influences saved your life and you know it was not the A. F. of L. You know that Gompers and his gang wanted you and Haywood and Pettibone hung twelve years ago just as the same gang wants Haywood to be kept in the penitentiary today. You know that this gang, this Gompers gang that you are now cheek by jowl with, never lifted a finger to help you, but, on the contrary, did everything they could in a sneaking and underhanded way to send you to the gallows until the Socialists and the loyal men in the labor movement had stirred up the country and made your acquittal practically certain and then only did they allow themselves to drift with the current and reluctantly concede—and it strained them not a little to make the concession—that you were really entitled to a fair trial.

You know this to be the fact as well as I do. John M. O'Neil, your official associate and editor of your magazine, fiercely denounced Gompers and his crowd for their perfidy and cowardice. You know this, too, and you also know that at your official headquarters there was not a day that passed that Gompers and his pals, whom you are now currying favor with, were not roundly denounced as corporation tools and traitors to union labor for their cowardly and contemptible attitude in the Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone affair at the time the Socialists stood almost alone in fighting their battle and the general belief was that they would be hanged as murderers.

And now, if this report is true, you have the handiwork to send before a body of labor delegates and tell them that it was the A. F. of L. that saved your life and to take the message back to their constituents and spread the lie in the Mexican labor movement so that it might be misled and betrayed into believing that the A. F. of L. is the only tried and trusted champion of the working class, while the I. W. W. is the traitorous conspiracy against labor which should be wiped from the earth.

I have had very positive differences with Haywood, as you well know, but if you made this statement to deceive the Mexican delegates, then I would rather a thousand times be Haywood in a penitentiary for the rest of my days than to be Moyer with a life tenure of the presidency of the western miners, or even the presidency of the United States.

You are quoted in your statement as having used the following language:

"Pettibone died, and on his death-bed he gave thanks to the American Federation of Labor for the help it had given him."

Who was present at this death-bed scene? Who was it that heard him express these thanks? I want to know and rest on your telling me. I know exactly how Pettibone felt toward Gompers and his crew at the A. F. of L. and I would be willing to stake my life that he never expressed his thanks to them for anything unless it might be for having earned his profound contempt.

Gompers and his A. F. of L. bunch helped to save your life and the lives of Haywood and Pettibone just as the same gentry helped to win the A. R. U. strike in 1891. They did not raise a finger in support of the strike, but in their characteristically cowardly and underhand way they did all they could to discourage and defeat it and not until they were virtually dragged to Chicago by the angry and threatening rank and file of their organization did they make a move and then only in the nature of a pretense of sympathy which they were compelled to make and which but masked their perfidy.

And that is precisely the kind of help they rendered Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone when their lives were at stake and the bones of the three of you would long since have been consumed in quicklime had you depended upon them to save you from the gallows.

It is quite true that some of the rank and file of the A. F. of L. joined in the movement to save you from being hanged, but they were mostly Socialists and they, above all others, denounced Gompers and the high officials for their cowardly and disgraceful attitude. You do not give these Socialists any credit however, to whom you actually owe your life, and you know that most of those who led in the movement in your behalf, especially at the beginning when you were branded by the capitalist press as murderers and assassins, did not belong to the A. F. of L. at all. You owe all your gratitude, according to yourself, to the Gompers administration, which in its heart wanted you hanged as high as Haman, and well do you remember it, from your own mouth have I heard your honest opinion of Gompers and his official associates.

But I have stood up for you, Charlie Moyer, in Butte and other places when you were attacked, charged with being a weakling, a fakir and a corporation tool. On my last trip out there I was warned at Butte not to attempt to defend you, but I did it, nevertheless, in a packed meeting I addressed, and I told your accusers to their faces that their charges against you could not go unchallenged while I was there.

And am I now to have to confess to those men that they knew you better than I did and apologize to them for the wrong I did them and the cause of labor in defending you? This will depend entirely upon yourself.

In your statement to the Laredo conference a deliberate and damning falsehood was put into the labor record and it shall not remain there if I can help it, and I think I can.

Awaiting your reply, I am,

Respectfully Yours,

EUGENE V. DEBS.

Socialism and Reaction in Austria

Continued from page eight

architect. I was not so childish as to believe that my deed would abolish absolutism in Austria, or that it would bring peace. I have not become an anarchist. Anarchism attributes such possibilities to individual action. I have never believed it. I stand, as I have always stood, for mass action carried out with all effective means that are in accord with the feeling of right of the masses—in times of peace by parliamentary means, but when absolutism has destroyed all parliamentary means, also by force—to be conducted by the masses. Today, as ever, I maintain that mass action must be, and is, decisive, and that my act has been nothing but a modest individual act, not to take the place of mass action, not even to call forth mass action, as some of my friends, who believe that I hoped for a concerted uprising of the people in answer to my deed, have said. What I wanted was to establish the psychological premise for future mass action, in Austria. I did not hope, by my deed, to call forth a revolution, but I wished to force the party to consider its attitude to a revolution. I have never, I should like to call the attention of the public prosecutor to this fact—during the course of the whole war, said a word in favor of forcible uprising because I

knew that, in the atmosphere in which I was condemned to live, in the milieu of this Executive Committee and this party, such words cannot be spoken. They have lost all understanding for the fact that force can only be created by action. They, in their cynicism, would have laughed at me. It was necessary, therefore, to present an avowal of the use of force, an avowal that would force the comrades to say, "This man is serious. He sacrifices his life in order to affirm his convictions." I wanted to force them to take a stand, and they have taken a stand. To-day no Renner, no Seitz will dare say to the workers of Austria that forcible measures must not and cannot be used. That was what I desired to accomplish, what seemed to me worth the sacrifice of my life, to force these people to change their attitude.

I will add here that I have never over-estimated my deed, either before or after the first police hearing; I do not wish that my deed be over-estimated, either in its object, or in its effect. I simply wished once more to give the revolutionary spirit a place in our movement.

It was an open avowal of the policy of force, but it was a symbolic act, a parable as well. By it I wished

to show to the masses what could be accomplished on a large scale, that each and every one must be willing to sacrifice his life, that sacrifice should not be limited, but that one must be ready to sacrifice. You object that I have committed this deed against the principles of the social democracy. This also is not true. The International has admitted parties which, before the war, stood in their programs for individual action; the Social Revolutionists of Russia. I was one of their opponents, and have always carried on a sham theoretical fight against them. Mass actions must be supreme.

I do not know whether a speedy death will release me, or whether fate will condemn me to an endless living death. But, when I stand face to face with my end, I have but one issue, that my nerves and my senses may serve me well in the last moment.

In taking leave of all whom I have loved, and whose love has been my brightness, from all my friends and comrades in all parts of the world, I will remind you, in parting, as a word of comfort, of the depth and purity of that latter greeting.

Not all are dead that are buried, for they cannot kill the spirit, oh, brothers!

Socialism and Reaction in Austria

By Friedrich Adler

(From Adler's speech in court at his trial for the assassination of Premier Stuergh.)

I DESIRE to declare that I deny all responsibility for any statements made here by my attorney and that I am determined to oppose, most emphatically, any attempt on the part of my counsel to present an insanity plea in my favor. It may be the duty of the attorney to take care of my body but it is my duty to protect my convictions, which are more important than the hanging of one man more in Austria during the war. The case is a much more serious one than that which is engrossing my attorney here. I desire, therefore, to say from the start: I did not commit this deed in a fit of mental darkness, but after ripe consideration: I have considered it for a year and a half, have weighed all its effects, from every side.

In the whole of Austria, no one is competent but the ministers and they have turned the constitution into a scrap of paper and have refused to be called to account. I ask you, therefore, what is to be done when there is no institution through which these eleven people may be called to account, what method remains but that of force? What other possibility is there, when a minority rules by force, to call it to account, except the methods which they themselves are using? Does not, under such circumstances, force become a necessity, just as you have always said of war? In a state, which is called an orderly society, under such circumstances is there anything left but force? I will not speak of the right of revolution. The Social Democratic Party, upon whose program I have always stood and still stand today, does not deny force and has not condemned its use. It has declared in its program that it will use, for the realization of its aims, all effective means that are in accord with the natural sense of justice of the people.

The state's attorney intimates that I am an enemy of Austria. The state's attorney mentions that I accused the Arbeiter Zeitung of patriotic excesses, that I attacked Dr. Renner for his Austrianism. I do not claim to be a patriot. I have never made this claim, neither before nor during the war, nor will you believe that I, in order to gain your sympathy, will throw my convictions aside and say, "I am a patriot." You will see later that an entirely different train of thought has guided me. I have heard the word patriot frequently used in Austria as an abuse and this is not surprising, for patriotism in Austria is a peculiar thing. Long before the war Austrian patriotism was denounced not only by social-democrats, but even by bourgeois as something inferior. The intelligent bourgeois was everywhere not patriotic but nationalist; I need only call your attention to the fact that those people of the Deutsche National Verband, who to-day are so indignant at the unpatriotic activity of the Chekhs, at one time called us the "k. k. (imperial) social democracy," to express their deepest contempt. At that time, the German bourgeois openly declared that its ideal was not Austria but the national state, that it belonged to the state of its nationality.

But in the course of developments this war has evolved a change of functions in the conception of Fatherland.

In former times there were no fatherlands, but simply nations which had to be governed. Since the 70's the ideal of a national state has come to life in the bourgeoisie and so Austria was looked upon as a remnant of olden times, that was expected sooner or later to fall apart into its separate national entities. Now this idea of the fatherland has met a new conception, one that is no longer based upon nationalist lines, but upon questions of economic interests. The bourgeoisie has discovered its interest in the conservation of the economic field of Austria; an interest not only in Austria but in the foundation of a great Central European empire with the King of Prussia, of course, at its head, to whom Austria shall be subservient. Its ideal is no longer national independence but national rule. They are no longer satisfied with the class rule of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat, they aspire to establish a kingdom from Berlin to Bagdad, over which the German people, i. e., the German bourgeoisie, shall rule.

Since the beginning of the war the same national and economic policy has made itself felt in other nations. We have seen that among the Chekhs, too, economic interests have come into a sharp conflict with national interests. But the same change of functions has taken place within the Social Democracy. When Belob attacked Bismarck most violently, it was not because he had created the German Imperial government in place of a German Republic, but because he had created a Prussian Germany in place of a Greater Germany, for which the German democracy of that time and with it the labor democracy had been fighting. Now we see in this war that the labor

movement has deviated from this old national principle, that the Social Democrats have adopted the imperialist mode of thought, and are defending a program in which they do not defend the German national state—which would correspond with the national defense of the French and the Belgians, but the integrity of the German Empire, including even its colonies. There was a period in the war when Social-democrats sacrificed the international character of their movement by openly supporting a policy of might and strategic securities. There have been Social-Democrats who have gone so far as to surrender themselves to the shameless policy of conquest of Imperialism.

The party has always maintained that Austria can exist only as a federation of national states; much energy was spent in the effort to spread recognition of the necessity of democracy in the nation. I cannot, of course, foretell what will become of this nation in this war. There are only two eventualities, and I have furthered neither of these eventualities, but have, rather, occupied a strictly neutral position toward Austria. The Socialist cause, I have always maintained, is far greater than any temporary state formation, and we must therefore refuse to compromise or bind its fate by an intimate identity with the fate of a nation, a mistake that was made in the past, I regret to say, by a number of my former friends. Little as I shall claim the title patriot, I nevertheless refuse to be termed anti-patriot, particularly when this is a part in my motives, not the national, but the moral existence of Austria, the Austrian spirit.

It is the state's lack of principle that has bred in me a hatred, not against Austria as a country, but against Austria as an immoral entity, against its lying spirit. This Austrian spirit exists in all of its parts and in all of its nations; all are degraded by it, and in all it is being fostered by lawlessness. And if you wish to understand what brought me here, it was that this lying spirit has entered into my party, that Dr. Karl Renner, who is nothing less than the Lueger of the Social Democracy, has brought this readiness to humbug into our movement. I have become ashamed of the odium that it reflects upon us.

In this whole crisis I have tried in vain to shake off the filth that has been spewed by these politicians on that which has always filled my whole being. I have attempted again and again to get away to place myself in opposition to those who have betrayed the spirit of my party. That is the real cause for my deed. It was a protest against this spirit that has entered our movement.

I have, all my life been a revolutionist. I have seen in the daily political activity of the party a weapon for the revolution and have never regarded revolution as a catch phrase of political activity. Had I spoken of revolution seven months ago you would have laughed at the idea of a revolution in times of war. The counsel would have called for alienists and you would have thought him justified. But today, not only the Arbeiter-Zeitung but the entire capitalist press rejoices over the Russian revolution. To be sure, these gentlemen have ever been enthusiastic for freedom in other countries. And to-day even the Arbeiter-Zeitung celebrates the revolution in Russia.

It makes a great difference whether you look at the world from the walls that separate the nations from one another, from the walls that the war has built, or whether you see it from the wall that to me has always been the most important, the wall of the classes that separates the exploiters from the exploited.

We Socialists have always looked upon the world from the point of view of the class struggle—until the war began—and have subordinated everything else in the whole world to this highest point of view. We have looked upon the International as supreme, and yet there are people who say we must change this point of view; in peace the struggle between classes, in war the struggle between nations.

I went through an exhausting struggle to bring back my comrades to the International position. The position of the International looks exceedingly naive. It is the same position that Marx described, when he said in 1844, that it is simply the attempt to establish the simple laws that regulate relations between private individuals as the highest law in the relations of democracy to each other. This morale of revolutionary democracy which was first formulated in the Great Revolution is promulgated in the Constitution of 1791: "The greatness of freedom lies in the maxim: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Naive as it may be, that is the morale of democracy, the morale that has again been taken up by the Russian revolution in opposition to land-robbers,

that has been handed down from generation to generation with the principle of equality of all people, by working for peace without annexations and indemnities.

I am convinced that the great majority of Social Democrats went into this war only because they believed it to be a war of self-defence, and from the point of view of national defence it is to be understood that the nation should defend its entity. That is still Social-democratic. But then the idea of visiting the defeat that we were trying to avoid, with all its horrors and all its misery, upon others, took possession of us. It was the idea that found expression in the Arbeiter-Zeitung on the 5th of August in the words, "However the die may be cast, we hope, from the depths of our hearts, that it may be cast for the victory of the whole cause of the German people." This word victory was emphasized more and more strongly as time went by, and it became the main point of difference between us, for, as Socialists, we must oppose those who seek to profit from this war. Just as the man who is attacked in the forest by robbers and uses all his strength to throw them off, would not think of robbing his attacker when he has him in his power, so should we refuse, in our relations with other nations, to sink down to the level of street robbers. But when I insisted at the national conference last March that the party executive should demand emphatically of the Central Powers a bid for peace without annexation and indemnities, I was laughed at and had only sixteen of the 100 delegates on my side. At first I feared that a short victorious war would anchor absolutism firmly for decades to come. But the long months of war, with its horrible ravages and destruction, have awakened in the people a realization of its misery, have inoculated the organism of the people with its anti-toxin, have created the sentiment of which Goethe speaks when he says: "He who desires war in times of peace, has lost, forever, the joy of hope." A short war would have been followed by decades of chauvinistic frenzy on both sides; war, out of itself, so to speak, creates true pacifism. For the lessons that the war has taught will stick in the minds of even those who, like Funder and his ilk, praised war as a bath of steel.

It was a terrible disappointment for me to discover that the Austrian Social Democracy, which has been the highest thing in my whole existence, was but a blind leader of the blind in Austria. I cannot measure the Socialist party by capitalist standards, but alone by the standard it has set itself in its own glorious history. And it hurts me, that this party should have adopted the evil traits of its opponents. I came into conflict with the Party Executive Committee particularly because it has become more and more a counter-revolutionary institution. The conviction has grown upon me that a revolution in Austria can come only against the will of the Executive Committee, which will always be a hindrance to the revolutionary movement. And for this Executive Committee I had to work as its first secretary and to attend all of its meetings. I realized then more and more clearly, when once matters become serious, my position will bring me into a sharp inner conflict between my duties as secretary and my own personal convictions. I came to the conclusion that our movement can recover only if it is given an entirely new leadership. Seitz particularly always harped upon responsibility. Violent methods must be persecuted, for the Executive Committee must bear the responsibility for the blood that is shed. But I maintain that this responsibility must be borne. The secret of this whole inner conflict lies in the fact that the party, in these long years of peace has developed organizations, writers, political representatives, in short a whole civil staff, but lacks officers; in the fact that nobody in Austria has realized that, under certain circumstances, force must be used. On the contrary, they have always made it their duty to prevent disturbances. Dr. Renner struck the note that dominated this whole attitude of the party regarding the use of forcible measures. I saw that the idea of force was to be discredited in the eyes of the working class.

This opposition drove me to individual action because the party and its leadership had lost the revolutionary feeling of the working class. What I wished to prove was that only over the heads and against the will of the party authorities in Austria can a real revolutionary upheaval in Austria come, that only by disregarding them will it be possible to use the force that must be used to overthrow the rule of force upon which our government rests. Now Dr. Renner will prove to you at once that individual action is in opposition to social-democratic principles, that it is an

Continued on page seven